

## Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on February 28, 2006. Claims 16-19 are standing for examination. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 16 and 19 are rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, 9 and 13 of U.S. patent 6,381,362.

In response to the rejections and comments provided by the Examiner, applicant herein amends claim 19 to overcome the 112 rejection. Applicant provides a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) to overcome the double patenting rejection.

Applicant believes with the acceptance of the Terminal Disclaimer and the amendment to claim 19, all of the claims standing (16-19) are patentable over the art. As all of the claims standing for examination are now patentable as amended and argued by applicant over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Sanjay Deshpande et al.

By /Donald R. Boys/  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457